

of morphine sulphate to each tablet; the strychnine sulphate tablets labeled " $\frac{1}{80}$ Gr." averaged not more than 0.0101 grain of strychnine sulphate to each tablet, those labeled " $\frac{1}{30}$ Gr." averaged not more than 0.0285 grain of strychnine sulphate to each tablet; the codeine sulphate tablets labeled " $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr." averaged not more than 0.209 grain of codeine sulphate to each tablet, and those labeled " $\frac{1}{2}$ Gr." averaged not more than 0.378 grain of codeine sulphate to each tablet.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statements "Tablets Morphine Sulphate $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr." "Tablet Triturates Morphine Sulphate $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr.," "Tablet Triturates Strychnine Sulphate $\frac{1}{80}$ Gr.," "Tablet Strychnine Sulphate $\frac{1}{80}$ Gr.," "Tablet Triturates Codeine Sulphate $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr.," and "Tablet Triturates Codeine Sulphate $\frac{1}{2}$ Gr.," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the respective articles, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the tablets contained the amounts of the respective articles declared on the labels, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said tablets contained less amounts.

On April 14, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$60.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13322. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. v. 200 Cases and 400 Cases of Oranges. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 19816. I. S. Nos. 21111-v, 21113-v. S. No. W-1646.)

On February 21, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 600 cases of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the California Fruit Growers Exchange, from Wilmington, Calif., February 4, 1925, and transported from the State of California into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. A portion of the article was labeled in part: "Blue Bowl Brand Redlands Heights Growers, Inc., Redlands, Calif." The remainder was labeled in part: "W. Navels Redlands Pride Bryn Mawr Fruit Growers Assn. Redlands San Bernardino Co., Calif."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, an inedible product, had been substituted wholly or in part for normal oranges of good commercial quality.

On February 28, 1925, the California Fruit Growers Exchange, Portland, Oreg., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be used in the manufacture of marmalade.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13323. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 240 Cases of Salmon. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 17360. I. S. No. 5870-v. S. No. C-3915.)

On March 13, 1923, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 240 cases of salmon, at Fort Worth, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Canada, on or about October 12, 1922, and transported from a foreign country into the United States, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Blanchard Brand Alaska Pink Salmon Packed By Beauclaire Packing Co. Port Beauclerc, Alaska."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated in violation of section 7 of the said act, in that it was decomposed.

On April 13, 1925, the Beauclaire Packing Co., Port Beauclerc, Alaska, having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations

of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department and the good portion released.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13324. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Eastern Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$220. (F. & D. No. 18577. I. S. Nos. 2798-v, 13701-v, 15840-v, 15842-v, 15843-v, 15847-v, 15878-v, 15879-v, 10590-v, 13702-v, 13707-v, 15841-v, 15846-v, 15848-v, 15850-v, 13704-v.)

On December 15, 1924, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Eastern Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Edenton, N. C., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, in various consignments, between the dates of October 30, 1923, and November 19, 1923, from the State of North Carolina into the States of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, respectively, of quantities of cottonseed meal which was misbranded. The article was labeled, variously, in part: "Perfection Cotton Seed Meal 100 Lbs. Net Manufactured By Eastern Cotton Oil Company * * * Guarantee Protein not less than 41.00% Equivalent to Ammonia 8.00% * * * Fibre not more than 10.00%" and "100 lbs. Net Monarch Brand * * * Prime Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Protein (minimum) 43.00% * * * Crude Fibre (maximum) 10.00%."

Analyses of samples of the Monarch brand meal by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed 39.75 per cent of protein and 12.60 per cent of crude fiber. Analyses of samples of the Perfection brand meal by said bureau showed that it contained from 38.25 per cent to 40.44 per cent of protein, from 7.44 per cent to 7.86 per cent of ammonia, and from 10.42 per cent to 12.54 per cent of crude fiber. Examination by said bureau of the Perfection brand meal showed that the sacks in certain of the consignments contained less than 100 pounds of the article.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, namely, "Protein not less than 41.00% Equivalent to Ammonia 8.00% Fibre not more than 10.00%," with respect to the Perfection brand meal, the statements "100 Lbs. Net," with respect to a portion of the Perfection brand meal, and "Guaranteed Analysis Protein (minimum) 43.00% Crude Fibre (maximum) 10.00%," with respect to the Monarch brand meal, were false and misleading, in that they represented that the Perfection brand meal contained not less than 41 per cent of protein, equivalent to 8 per cent of ammonia, and not more than 10 per cent of crude fiber, and that the sacks containing a portion of the Perfection brand meal contained not less than 100 pounds net thereof, and that the Monarch brand meal contained not less than 43 per cent of protein and not more than 10 per cent of crude fiber, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the Perfection brand meal contained not less than 41 per cent of protein, equivalent to 8 per cent of ammonia, and not more than 10 per cent of crude fiber, that the sacks containing the said portion of the Perfection brand meal contained not less than 100 pounds net thereof, and that the Monarch brand meal contained not less than 43 per cent of protein and not more than 10 per cent of crude fiber, whereas the said Perfection brand meal contained less than 41 per cent of protein, less than the equivalent of 8 per cent of ammonia, and more than 10 per cent of crude fiber, and the sacks containing the said portion of the Perfection brand meal contained less than 100 pounds net thereof, and the Monarch brand meal contained less than 43 per cent of protein and more than 10 per cent of crude fiber. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the said portion of the Perfection brand meal for the further reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On April 13, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$220.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*